



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1400  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/010.916

12/06/2001

Ted Alspach

07844-514001

6109

21876 7590 03/08/2007

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

P.O. Box 1022

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

JONES, HUGH M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2128

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/08/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Response to Rule 312 Communication</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/010,916	ALSPACH, TED	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Hugh Jones	2128	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 16 February 2007 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

- a) ☐ entered.
- b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.
- c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

- d) ☒ disapproved. See explanation below.
- e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

*The amendment changes the scope of the claims and requires further consideration. The "means for" claims also require further consideration in view of the specification. It also appears that some of the "means for" limitations in the dependent claims may sufficiently modify other preceding "means for" limitations, thus raising questions about enablement, written disclosure and whether 112-6<sup>th</sup> paragraph is invoked. Furthermore, the new "means for" limitations raise issues about equivalents. See MPEP 2105, 2181. Finally, Applicants have not pointed to any portion of the specification corresponding to the structure. More than a cursory review is required.*

**HUGH JONES Ph.D.**  
**PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**